

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated February, 24, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Anderson in View of McIntyre Rejections

Claims 2-3, 10-11, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,961,604 (Anderson) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,538 (McIntyre).

Anderson in view of McIntyre does not teach, disclose, suggest, or make obvious displaying an indication of operating characteristics of UPS devices as recited in independent claim 2. Anderson discusses a section 220 that includes multiple pieces of discrete data about a particular power supply connected to an Internet browser (e.g., Netscape Navigator). Anderson, FIG. 7, col. 5, ll. 7-19. The pieces of discrete data provide information regarding general status, self test alarm, fan status, temperature status, low oil pressure, crank limit, etc. of the particular power supply. *Id.* Independent claim 2, however, recites a system that displays a single monitoring icon with a normal indication if each operating characteristic of each of the plurality of UPS devices being monitored by the system is diagnosed to be in a normal state, and displaying the single monitoring icon with an abnormal indication if at least one of the UPS operating characteristics of at least one of the plurality of UPS devices being monitored is diagnosed to be in an abnormal state. The Examiner does not assert that McIntyre makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to Anderson. Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claim 2 is patentable over Anderson in view of McIntyre.

Claim 3, which depends from independent claim 2, stands rejected as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of McIntyre. The Examiner did not assert that McIntyre makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to Anderson and claim 2. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 2, claim 3 is patentable over Anderson in view of McIntyre.

Anderson in view of McIntyre further fails to teach, disclose, suggest, or make obvious a processor in operable communication with a display as recited in claim 10.

Anderson discusses a section 220 that includes multiple pieces of discrete data about a particular power supply connected to an Internet browser (e.g., Netscape Navigator). Anderson, FIG. 7, col. 5, ll. 7-19. The pieces of discrete data provide information regarding general status, self test alarm, fan status, temperature status, low oil pressure, crank limit, etc. of the particular power supply. *Id.* Independent claim 10, however, recites a system that includes a processor in operable communication with a display, the processor being configured to generate a single monitoring symbol having a first indicator on the display if each operating characteristic of each of the plurality of UPS devices being monitored is in a first state, and a single monitoring symbol having a second indicator if at least one operating characteristic of at least one of the plurality of the UPS devices being monitored is in a second state. The Examiner does not assert that McIntyre makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to Anderson. Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claim 10 is patentable over Anderson in view of McIntyre.

Anderson in view of McIntyre further fails to teach, disclose, suggest, or make obvious means for displaying an indication of operating characteristics of a plurality of UPSs as recited in claim 17. Anderson discusses a section 220 that includes multiple pieces of discrete data about a particular power supply connected to an Internet browser (e.g., Netscape Navigator). Anderson, FIG. 7, col. 5, ll. 7-19. The pieces of discrete data provide information regarding general status, self test alarm, fan status, temperature status, low oil pressure, crank limit, etc. of the particular power supply. *Id.* Independent claim 17, however, recites a system that includes means for generating and displaying a single monitoring icon with a normal indication if each operating characteristic of each of a plurality of UPS devices are diagnosed to be in a normal state and means for generating and display a single monitoring icon with an abnormal indication if at least one of the operating characteristics of at least one of the plurality of UPS devices coupled to the system is diagnosed to be in an abnormal state. The Examiner does not assert that McIntyre makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to Anderson. Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claim 17 is patentable over Anderson in view of McIntyre.

Claim 11, which depends from independent claim 10, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of McIntyre. The Examiner does not assert that McIntyre makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to independent claim 10 from which dependent claim 11 depends. Thus, dependent claim 11 is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 10.

Anderson in View of McIntyre in view of Chin Rejections

Claims 4-9, 12-16, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of McIntyre in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,456,306 (“Chin”).

Claims 4-9, which depend from independent claim 2, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of McIntyre in view of Chin. The Examiner does not assert that Chin makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to independent claim 2 from which dependent claims 4-9 depend. Thus, dependent claims 4-9 are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 2.

Claims 12-16, which depend from independent claim 10, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of McIntyre in view of Chin. The Examiner does not assert that Chin makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to independent claim 10 from which dependent claims 12-16 depend. Thus, dependent claims 12-16 are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 10.

Claim 18, which depends from independent claim 17, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of McIntyre in view of Chin. The Examiner does not assert that Chin makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to independent claim 17 from which dependent claim 18 depends. Thus, dependent claim 18 is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 17.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, this application is believed to be in allowable condition, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If a telephone conversation with Applicant's representative would help expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (617) 542-6000.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 50-0311, Reference No. 18133-102.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kyle Turley/
Shane Hunter, Reg. No. 41,858
Kyle Turley, Reg. No. 57,197
Attorneys for Applicants
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS,
GLOVSKY AND POPEO, PC
One Financial Center
Boston, MA 02111
Tel.: (617) 542-6000
Fax: (617) 542-2241
Customer No. 30623

Date: May 24, 2006

TRA 2153478v.1